***

EDO 24069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UNDERSTANDING THE COLLEGE STUDENT LAWBREAKER[1]

Oscar T. Lenning

The University of Iowa

Some student personnel workers spend much time dealing with students involved in minor violations of civil law. Common practice is to use traditional methods of discipline and the disciplinary interview to "help the student see the error of his ways." But are such arbitrary methods best for the student? Such "therapy" may only motivate him not to get caught next time. A better understanding of these students, however, could lead to more effective practices.

One way to gain insights would be to set up and study a model of students in general who commit such offenses. Understanding the model could possibly suggest effective therapeutic measures for a typical case. It might also suggest preferable methods for evaluating the effects of any therapy that is undertaken. Finally, the model might even suggest, by describing the reasons for committing offenses, preventative measures to reduce the incidence of such lawlessness.

You may be saying by now that this is fine, but you are interested in understanding the individual person. Every case will be unique and

---

[1] Paper prepared for the session "Research Papers: A Meeting of the Practitioner and the Researcher" presented at the 1968 annual meeting of the American Personnel & Guidance Association, April 9, 1968, Detroit, Michigan.

CG 003 013

deviate in some respects from the model. This is certainly true, and a basic tenet of the counseling profession is to gain a thorough understanding of the person in trouble. Each person must be studied in terms of his characteristics, his environment, and the situation in which the offense occurred. However, comparing the individual to a model should encourage further insights.

Since we are trying to understand why the law-breaking student acts in a discrepant way, it is logical to develop a differential rather than a purely descriptive model. In fact, most previous studies of such students have compared them to non-lawbreaking students (Bazik & Meyering, 1965; Clark, 1964; Cummins, 1966; Elon & Rose, 1966; Hathaway & Monachesi, 1954; Lemay & Murphy, 1967; Nyman & LeMay, 1967; Williamson, et al., 1965). However, such published research has been limited to comparisons on personality tests and on student folder information. Also, some of the findings were probably distorted by interaction effects. Most of the studies made little or no attempt to control for confounding variables. The present pilot study was designed to avoid some of these difficulties. Furthermore, it demonstrates the value of working from a theoretical framework and of looking at results from different points of view.

Theoretical Formulation

We counselors, with our psychological background, could profit from a sociologist's point of view. Sometimes we get so involved in a

frame of reference that we cannot step outside of it and so are not very creative. The theory I chose as a "proposition mill" for this study is based on behavioral psychology and elementary economics, and was formulated by Homans (1961), a sociologist. I have found Homan's Human Exchange theory interesting and valid from an "arm chair" point of view, and Homans claims that his theory has applications to all mankind and to all social behavior (Homans, 1961, p. 6).

Homans' theory deals with elementary social behavior, the "face to face contact between individuals" (Homans, 1961, p. 7) in which a person's amount and kind of behavior "depends on the amount and kind of reward and punishment it fetches" (Homans, 1961, p. 13). The reward or punishment each gets from the behavior of others is considered to be relatively direct and immediate.

Homans speaks of psychological "costs" (punishment, value foregons, alternative and rewarding activity forgone, etc.) and "rewards" (value received, praise, satisfactions, pleasures, help, avoidance of punishment, etc.). Then Homans defines psychic "profit" as reward less cost and argues that no exchange (reward for reward, reward for costs, costs for costs) continues "unless both parties are making a profit (Homans, 1961, p. 61). Homans does not make it clear, but psychological costs and rewards are not wholly rational. The value one perceives (or feels) may be very irrationally reached and be based almost completely on feelings or on unrealistic expectations and

perceptions. Maladjusted people, like well-adjusted ones, have perceptions and feelings that determine their behavior. And all of these perceptions and feelings are determined by the individual's characteristics and by what has happened (or not happened) in his past.

If there were only one or two social rewards or costs to consider for any situation, or if all of the relevant variables were apparent and had accurate plus or minus values, the "Homan's method" of hypothesizing would work well. The actual case is that many variables, some of them not at all apparent to the individual or the observer, influence the person's behavior in any situation. In addition, the same event may elicit exactly opposite meanings to two very similar individuals because of different perceptions, motivations, values, emotions, etc. Furthermore, the addition or subtraction of influencing variables affects the other variables and their results; in other words, there are interaction effects.

Obviously, then, as with all theories of personality, one cannot expect phenomenal prediction success. But the predictions do have logical reasoning behind them and conceivably can give a better understanding of the individual. We can never completely understand the individual, but a little understanding is better than none if we are to deal with him realistically.

It may seem futile to generate hypotheses with a theory that applies only to social behavior at a particular moment. But it must be

remembered that different members of a particular group of people often have much in common and often find themselves in similar situations. In fact, Homans' purpose in formulating his theory was to explain large group findings. For example, he wanted to explain the findings in his previous sociological study of an entire New England town (Homans, 1961, pp. 8-12).

Homans believes that the empirical findings of social psychological research can be explained by application of five basic propositions. These propositions are (Homans, 1961, pp. 30-32):

> (1) If in the past the occurrence of a particular stimulus-situation has been the occasion on which a man's activity has been rewarded, then the more similar the present stimulus-situation is to the past one, the more likely he is to emit the activity, or some similar activity, now.
>
> (2) The more often within a given period of time a man's activity rewards the activity of another, the more often the other will emit the activity.
>
> (3) The more valuable to a man a unit of the activity another gives him, the more often he will emit activity rewarded by the activity of the other.
>
> (4) The more often a man has in the recent past received a rewarding activity from another, the less valuable any further unit of that activity becomes to him.
>
> (5) The more to a man's disadvantage the rule of distributive justice fails of realization, the more likely he is to display the emotional behavior we call anger (or if it works to his advantage he will feel guilt).

Actually, Homans does not go beyond everyday meanings in defining his terms, and he is very vague; e.g., he defines "value" as the

value per unit of activity received. He has not been concerned with how values are acquired nor with such psychological processes as ambivalence and inner conflict. Homans' perceptive and elegant prose and his insightful examples make up for these inadequacies, however. In addition, his theory met my prerequisites in that it provided an interestingly different way of looking at things and it generated testable hypotheses that were supported by logical thinking.

As an example of how Homans' theory can be used to generate hypotheses,. I would hypothesize that a college student arrested for disorderly conduct or intoxication would most likely be an unmarried male. Such trouble would usually mean more social cost to a girl in our society than a boy. It would also mean more cost to a husband than an unmarried man because he has serious social obligations to his wife, and the high cost of getting on the "bad side" of the person closest to him will create an inhibition against taking such chances. The risks far outweigh the probable reward. And he receives psychological rewards for not committing such actions, too.

The Formation of Hypotheses

Some studies have found personality differences between disciplinary and non-disciplinary college males. Elon and Rose (1966) found that their disciplinary students were less conforming, and "less able to adapt their impulse controls to the demands of the environment."

Several studies have found differences between disciplinary and non-disciplinary undergraduate males on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Hathaway and Monachesi (1953) and Clark (1964) noted higher scores for disciplinary males on the exciter scales 4, 8, and 9 (psychopathic deviate, schizophrenia, and hypomania) and lower scores than non-disciplinary males on the suppressor scales 0, 2, and 5 (social introversion, depression, and masculinity-femininity). Lemay and Murphy (1967) confirmed the differences on the 4 and 9 scales. Such an MMPI profile would indicate (Welsh and Dahlstrom, 1960) a male who has repeated and flagrant disregard for social customs and mores, emotional shallowness in relation to others (especially in sexual and affectional display), and little sense of responsibility. He is further characterized by freedom from conflicts and anxieties, sexual preoccupation, problems with peer relationships and group acceptance, parental conflicts, irritability and hostility, aggressive and belligerent behavior, and easy morals. He is impulsive, poor at planning ahead, and lacking in judgment and control. In superficial relationships and social situations he is outgoing and confident, which creates a favorable first impression. He is lively, conversational, fluent, frank, and he readily takes part in parties and outings. There is a tendency to overdo things that interest him, and he often gets so carried away by these activities that he neglects his obligations to others. He is also assertive, adventurous, reckless, and he is a showoff (talkative, vigorous,

competitive, and exhibitionistic). It is especially important for him to show his masculinity; to go along with the gang and show that he is not afraid and can take it.

Using the above hypothetical picture and Homans' theory, differences were hypothesized between disciplinary and non-disciplinary students matched on aptitude, year in college, college major, marital status, and age. It was hypothesized that the disciplinary students should have lower college grades, less participation in scholarly and character building types of organized student activities, more participation in athletics and partying types of activities, less emphasis on intellectual goals, more emphasis on collegiate goals, less realistic perceptions, and more antagonism towards the university administration (but not necessarily the university faculty).

Design

The subjects for this study were all male undergraduate students at a large state university who had been convicted of disorderly conduct, intoxication, or underage drinking by civil authorities (October 1, 1966, to May 1, 1967). The sample (misdemeanor group) was composed of 40 subjects, 8 of whom left school before the questionnaires were sent out in May. The mean university percentile rank on the ACT Composite[2]

---

[2]Composite score on the American College Tests.

was 55.7, and 20 different educational majors were represented in the group. Twelve of the misdemeanor students were freshmen, thirteen were sophomores, eleven were juniors, and four were seniors. The mean age for the entire group was 20.1 years, and only one of the students was married.

A control group of 40 male undergraduate students with no disciplinary record was formed by matching certain variables which had differentiated in one or more previously published studies. Using stratified random methods, I matched the control group to the misdemeanor group on ACT composite score (Elon & Rose, 1966), age (Bazik & Meyering, 1965), year in college (Bazik & Meyering, 1965; Tisdale & Brown, 1965), marital status (Tisdale & Brown, 1965), and major field of study (Bazik & Meyering, 1965; Tisdale and Brown, 1965; Williamson, et al., 1952). Then questionnaires were sent to both groups by an independent non-university agency[3] to reduce biased responses. Each questionnaire had a code number at the bottom to facilitate the identification of students not responding and to use in computing correlations. Using questionnaire and student record data, I made statistical tests on variables in each of the following areas: achievement, activities, attitudes, goals, perceptions, persistence, and socio-economic background.

---

[3]The valuable assistance of the American College Testing Program is gratefully acknowledged.

Related t-tests were used to analyze continuous data and chi-square tests of independence to analyze all frequency data. Yates' correction was used in computing the chi-square for all 2 X 2 contingency tables.

Results

Of the 40 students in each group, 35 of the misdemeanor students and 38 of the control students answered the questionnaire. Complete questionnaire data was available for 34 (85%) of the matched pairs. Results of all statistical tests are presented in tables 1 - 4. Of the statistically significant differences ($P < .05$), the misdemeanor group consisted of the following[4]: fewer students emphasizing college academic goals; greater variance on the nonconformist (idealism) goals scale; more students withdrawing from college during the year; fewer students reporting participation in military ROTC; more students reporting participation in departmental clubs; more students reporting participation in social fraternities; more students saying that they dated more than twice a week; more students reporting participation in "riverbanking"[5]; more students with an expressed interest and liking for strictly social recreational activities; and fewer students with an expressed interest and

---

[4]Listed in the order that they appear in the tables.

[5]The university newspaper registration edition defines it as follows: "The university has many well established traditions. One of the most popular is river banking. All it takes is a boy and his girl, one blanket, a transistor radio and the bank of the _____ River."

liking for hobbies and recreational activities that are cultural-intellectual. Other significant results are positive correlations between the groups for college grades and a negative correlation for academic goals. Significant differences were not noted for high school mean GPA, overall college mean GPA, first semester mean GPA, vocational goals, social goals, self-perceived extra-curricular involvement in college or high school, perceived utility of extra-curricular activities, perceived faculty concern with students, perceived administration concern with students, response to the questionnaire, residence during the school year, hours of part-time work during the school year, fathers' occupational level, most important reason for attending college, and participation in thirteen specified college extra-curricular activities.

Discussion

Some very interesting differences were found between the misdemeanor and control groups, several of which supported previous research while others were unexpected. In summary, the misdemeanor group placed less emphasis on intellectual goals, placed less emphasis on cultural-intellectual hobbies and recreational activities, had greater interest and participation in social activities, had more who were members of social fraternities, had more who had gone "riverbanking," had more who dated twice a week, had more participation in departmental clubs, had less participation in ROTC, and had more who withdrew from school

during the year. Another difference was that, although the means did not differ significantly, the misdemeanor group was more heterogenous on the nonconformist (idealism) goals scale. Visual examination of the data indicated that this significantly larger variance was the result of more misdemeanor students being at both extremes of the scale.[6]

The two groups did not seem to differ very much in socio-economic background, in academic grades, in social and vocational college goals, and in various perceptions. It is apparent that, although they do differ in some important respects, the two groups are alike in many ways.

At first glance some of the findings may seem rather inconsistent, but they do form patterns that can fit in with Homans' theory and suggest hypotheses for further research. The misdemeanor group as a whole placed less emphasis on academic (intellectual) goals and yet maintained about the same grade point average. Furthermore, although they participated in more social activities, they did not give social goals greater emphasis.

The prediction had been that most disciplinary students would place more emphasis on social goals and participate more in athletics, partying, and social activities. Also, it was predicted that they would receive less profit from good grades and intellectual activities (assuming, that is, that a student would not become so worried about doing well academically that he had to become intoxicated periodically to "loosen up" and relax). I assumed that the modal misconduct student would be too much involved

---

[6]Chi-square analysis confirmed ($P < .05$) that many more misdemeanor students were at the extremes (seven or greater and two or less) of the scale.

with his crowd and "playing around" to want to give up more than he had to in order to get by academically. Intellectual activities would cost too much because they would take valuable time from his major activities and goals, which are social.

A key to the seeming inconsistencies noted in the social and intellectual realms is the finding that almost three times as many misdemeanor as control students belonged to social fraternities. This finding supports Tisdale and Brown's (1965) finding that more disciplinary students belong to fraternities with fewer living in dormitories. Such a cohesive organization as a fraternity would supposedly influence its members by exposing them to new experiences, by having specific requirements and role assignments, and by rewarding the expression of preferred ideas. Most social fraternities do reward social and campus activity participation and this could account for the significant differences in social activities. As for organized all-campus organizations, there was little participation for either group, but more misdemeanor students participated (although not significantly more in most cases) in eight all-campus activities[7] while more control students participated in only two such activities. The significantly less participation of the misdemeanor students in ROTC would be expected if they are less regimented and more antagonistic towards authority. The word ROTC is a symbol of discipline and authority without any "playboy" connotations. Student government was the other all-campus

---

[7]Many of these activities were intellectual-cultural. See Table 3.

activity in which more controls participated. However, the base rate of participation in student government on a large campus is extremely low, and the difference was not statistically significant, which makes it meaningless.

It is interesting to note that ten misdemeanor students and only three control students participated in student religious groups. If such participation truly indicated being religious, the hypothesis would probably state a ratio opposite to the actual one. However, since student religious groups offer social activity and provide "points" to the fraternity for activity participation, Homans' theory would probably hypothesize just as much, if not more, misdemeanor group participation in student religious groups.

The finding of no significant differences in "social goals" and "college grades" still has not been explained. The fact that control students placed much more emphasis on cultural-intellectual hobbies and recreational activities supports the finding of more emphasis on intellectual (academic) goals for these students. But this does not necessarily mean that most control students would gain more reward from good grades than would the misdemeanor students. Fraternities have academic competition, and the members must meet minimum grade requirements. Thus, even if they are not intellectually inclined, they might view grades as important, especially with the emphasis of "grades for the grades' sake" prevalent on most large university campuses. And with the fraternity test

files and the cohesive group help available, the cost in less social and extracurricular activity may not be any greater than whatever the costs are for the control student. Or it may be that the cost of academic failure would be greater for the fraternity member, which makes up for his greater cost involved in obtaining respectable grades. Another possibility is that intellectual goals may not have anything to do with getting good grades. In fact, people who emphasize intellectual goals have been known to detest this emphasis on grades rather than learning and have rebelled against it. Any one, or a combination, of the aforementioned possibilities could account for the fact that controls placed more emphasis on intellectual goals but did not have better grade averages.

Concerning the finding of no difference in emphasis on the social goals, perhaps the college goals of increasing one's ability in interpersonal relations, leadership, and social skills (the social goals listed on the questionnaire) are not particularly motivating factors for joining fraternities. It may be that status and the opportunity to be a member of a cohesive and social group are the primary motives. The misdemeanor student who is a fraternity member may already feel quite adept in social relations and, because he is socially inclined, merely wants to enjoy his skills. On the other hand, a student who feels that he lacks social skills may try to avoid social situations. He might greatly wish to improve his social competence, hoping that college will help him do this. Therefore, he might emphasize college goals in the social area just as much as the

fraternity member does.

The finding that significantly more misdemeanor students withdrew from college during the year supports another finding by Tisdale and Brown (1965). The hypothesis for this finding was based on the premise that leaving the situation might reduce the student's psychological cost of having gotten caught by civil authorities. Among other things, such a person might think that a new setting with people who do not know him will help reduce his conflicts and anxieties and allow him to make a new start. Perhaps past experiences have convinced him that leaving the scene will help him recover emotionally and "keep the school authorities off his back." Or it could be that he wanted to withdraw for some other unrelated reason (e.g., failing grades or lack of interest in school) and this would offer a good opportunity to do so without losing more face; it would hide the real reason. Another possibility is that the student had an unpleasant (and what he considers unfair) experience with university authorities over the incident, and this caused him to withdraw from the university; i.e., Homans' distributive justice.

I have mentioned several findings that support the results of previous research. However, two of my findings do not agree with all previously published results. First, the ACT composite university percentile rank of 55.7 does not support Elon and Rose's finding that reprimanded students receive lower ACT scores and thus have less academic ability. Rather, it would tend to support Bazik and Meyering (1965), and Williamson, et al. (1952), who found no significant differences on aptitude

between disciplinary and non-disciplinary students. Second, the finding of no significant difference in grades supports the Williamson, et al. (1952) results, but does not support Bazik and Meyering's (1965) finding that misdemeanor students had significantly lower grades. The present study is the only one of the three that specifically controlled for academic ability and its effect on grades.

The finding that more misdemeanor students were at both extremes on the non-conformist goals scale brings out a very important point. Different people do the same thing for a very different reason. In the present case, the goals were to learn how to deal with political or social injustice, to develop more personal independence and self-reliance, and to find a cause to really believe in. Evidentally, people who especially emphasize these goals would more often than not be in the misdemeanor group, and so would students who completely downgrade these goals.

Presumably both types of personalities receive some type of reward from the misdemeanor activity. Homans' theory might hypothesize that those scoring high on the nonconformist goals scale would receive social justice and independence rewards from the misdemeanor activities; e.g., gives them a feeling of independence and self determination or demonstrates their objection to these "annoying and unjust" laws. People scoring at the bottom end of the non-conformist goals scale probably are the psychopathic personalities who would receive immediate personal gratifications from such activity.

Just because our discussion emphasis has been on the discrepancies between the misdemeanor and control groups does not mean that the non-

significant findings are less important. It could be very useful to hypothesize explanations of why these results were non-significant; e.g., the hypotheses set forth earlier to explain the non-significant findings for social goals and for college grades.

Conclusion

This brief, and necessarily superficial, discussion of differences between misdemeanor and control groups has noted them primarily in terms of one theoretical viewpoint. There are undoubtedly many other ways of looking at them, and Homans would probably see many other manifestations in the results, but it should be clear that the findings are not necessarily inconsistent. In other words, I have presented a very rough first draft of a partial model for typical students arrested for disorderly conduct, intoxication, or underage consumption of alcohol. It is one of a number of such possible models and consists mainly of hypotheses that need to be tested. Some of these hypotheses are findings that need to be replicated and others are explanatory hypotheses that need to be researched.

One thing is apparent: social fraternities are suspect of having a central role in many cases of disorderly conduct, intoxication, and underage consumption of alcohol. Hodinko's (1964) study of student mores supports such a contention, also. He found that students in general do not consider that theft for novelty value, possession of beer on campus, and

drinking as a minor are very serious offenses. The important point for our consideration, however, is that fraternity men viewed such action most lightly of all. Whether it is in the role of drawing together certain types of students or of having a direct causal effect, fraternities do appear to have a major role.

The present study needs to be replicated with the control and misdemeanor groups matched on "social fraternity participation" to see if the differences for the other variables are still present. It would be important to know if "fraternity membership" is a confounding variable. As an example of how confounding effects can be present because of certain variables, note the significant correlations in Table 1. These correlations imply that one or more of the matched variables in the present study are related to certain of the variables under study and would have resulted in interaction effects had they not been canceled out by matching. Analysis of covariance or some other method of control would often be preferred for continuous data such as aptitude test scores.

Another possibility for improvement on the present study is to use a goals questionnaire that is more comprehensive and which has higher reliability. Such a questionnaire could better differentiate between groups on the variables being studied. Concerning the use of different test instruments, interest and other types of inventories have not been used to study law-breaking students. The present finding of differences on variables that had not been studied before implies that there may be other

variables not studied that will differentiate between disciplinary and non-disciplinary students.

Two other considerations for future research are first, larger sample sizes would be desirable and, second, different types of disciplinary students should be examined separately. The present sample is probably even too broad because Nyman and Lemay (1967) found that although their disorderly conduct and alcohol misconduct group both admitted to authority conflict more than the control group, they differed in their way of expressing it. Nyman and Lemay state that "disorderly conduct referrals are subject to an excess of energy and pressure for action, and act directly, disregarding the feelings of others; while the alcohol misconduct cases appear to have an 'inflated ego' which is hurt rather easily." Thus, it would probably be useful to study disorderly conduct and alcohol misconduct groups separately and then compare them with each other.

It seems that most disciplinary counselors actually do develop personal and informal theoretical models of typical disciplinary students, as they come into contact with a number of these cases over the years. The contention here is that differential models (between misconduct and control students and between different types of misconduct students) can be very useful to the disciplinary counselor. A further contention is that careful, empirical research which has been replicated in representative campus settings, or which applies specifically to the local population, can assist

the counselor by modifying his hypothetical models to make them more realistic. Clarifying his models as research suggests some sort of consensus, and comparing the individual to the applicable model, can appreciably help the disciplinary counselor understand and assist the student in trouble.

REFERENCES

Baird, L. L. The educational goals of college-bound youth. ACT Research Report No. 19. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1966.

Bazik, Anna M. & Meyering, R. A. Characteristics of college students involved in disciplinary problems. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, 1965, 28:173-176.

Clark, D. L. Exploring behavior in men's residence hall using the MMPI. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43:249-251.

Cummins, E. J. Are disciplinary students different? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44:624-627.

Dahlstrom, W. G and Welsh, G. J. An MMPI handbook: a guide to use in clinical practice and research. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Elon, C. F. and Rose, Henrietta A. Personality characteristics: Their relevance in disciplinary cases. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13:431-435.

Hathaway, S. E. and Monachesi, E. D. Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with the MMPI. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1953.

Hodinko, B. A. A study of student opinion regarding collegiate discipline situations. Journal of College Student Personnel. 1964, 5:217-219ff.

Homans, G. C. Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1961.

Hoyt, D. P., Lutz, Sandra W., and Munday, L. A. Your college bound students. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1967, pp. 13-15.

Lemay, M.and Murphy, T. A. MMPI patterns of college male disciplinary referrals. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8:85-89.

Nyman, A. J. and Lemay, M. L. Differentiation of types of college misconduct offenses with MMPI subscales. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 1967, 23:99-100.

Tisdale, J. R. and Brown, F. G. Characteristics of college misconduct cases. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1965, 6:359-366.

Trow, M. Student cultures and administrative action. In Sutherland, R. L., Holtzman, W. H., Horle, E. A., and Smith, B. K. (Eds.), Personality factors on the college campus, review of a symposium. Austin, Texas: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962.

Williamson, E. G., Jorve, W., and Langarstedt-Knudsen, Barbara. What kinds of collegestudents become disciplinary cases? Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1952, 12:608-619.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF MISDEMEANOR AND CONTROL GROUPS USING RELATED t-TESTS

	Number of Students in Each Group	Misdemeanor Group Mean($\overline{X}$)	S.D.	Control Group Mean($\overline{Y}$)	S.D.	r_{XY}	$t_{\overline{Y}-\overline{X}}$
Overall GPA	39[a]	2.24	0.51	2.31	0.57	.50**	0.50
First Semester GPA 1966-67	34[a]	2.04	0.72	2.17	0.73	.39*	0.95
High School GPA	27[b]	2.73	0.43	2.75	0.52	.25	0.23
College Goals[c]:							
Academic	34	6.24	1.29	7.15	1.38	-.37*	2.36*
Vocational	34	6.59	1.99	7.12	2.01	.16	1.17
Social	34	5.35	2.17	5.58	2.51	.05	0.42
Nonconformist[d]	34	4.97	2.71	5.12	1.88	-.12	0.24

*Significant at the P = .05 level.

**Significant at the P = .01 level.

[a]Overall GPA was not available for one student (a freshman) and first semester GPA was not available for six students because of cancellation of registration during the first semester.

[b]High school grades were not available for at least one student in each of thirteen matched pairs.

[c]Scored on a 0-9 scale with a higher score indicating that greater importance is place on goals of that type. Items to differentiate between college goals (using Trow's subcultures) were taken from the Student Profile Section of the American College Tests (Hoyt, Lutz, and Munday, 1967).

[d]Hartley's test for homogeneity of variance (Winer, 1962, pp. 93-94) indicates that the misdemeanor population variance is significantly greater ($P < .05$) than control population variance.

TABLE 2

CHI-SQUARE COMPARISIONS OF MISDEMEANOR AND CONTROL GROUPS ON PERCEPTIONS, PERSISTENCE, AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Questionnaire Item and Frequency Counts				d. f.	x^2
(1) Self-perceived extracurricular involvement in college:	Very Little	Average	Very Much		
Misdemanor Group	11	19	04	2	3.27
Control Group	18	12	04		
(2) Self-perceived extracurricular involvement in high school:	Very Little	Average	Very Much		
Misdemanor Group	03	13	18	2	1.73
Control Group	04	08	22		
(3) Perceived utility of extracurricular activities:	Very Little	Average	Very Much		
Misdemeanor Group	02	18	14	2	0.38
Control Group	03	19	12		
(4) Perceived faculty concern with students:	Very Little	Average	Very Much		
Misdemeanor Group	12	18	04	2	0.58
Control Group	10	18	06		
(5) Perceived administration concern with students:	Very Little	Average	Very Much		
Misdemeanor Group	20	13	01	2	1.59
Control Group	16	15	03		
(6) Response to the questionnaire:	No Followup Needed	Responded to a Reminder	Never Did Respond		
Misdemeanor Group	23	12	5	2	4.76
Control Group	32	6	2		
(7) Persistence in college[a]:	Withdrew from College	Remained in College			
Misdemeanor Group	8	32		1	4.51*
Control Group	1	39			

*Significant at the P = .05 level.

[a]Chi-square computed using Yates' Correction.

TABLE 3

MISDEMEANOR AND CONTROL GROUP ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION COMPARED USING CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS WITH YATES' CORRECTION

Activity	Activity Part. Frequencies[a] Misd. Group (N = 34)	Cont. Group (N = 34)	d.f.	X^2_y
Debate	03	01	1	0.27
Drama	06	03	1	0.51
Music	06	03	1	0.51
Student religious groups	10	03 (1)	1	3.42
Campus publications	04 (1)	01 (1)	1	0.86
Political groups	03	03	1	0.00
Intercollegiate athletics	08 (1)	04	1	0.91
Intramural athletics	24	18	1	1.56
Student government	02	04	1	0.18
Union Board	06 (1)	04 (1)	1	0.12
ROTC	05 (1)	14 (1)	1	4.67*
Departmental Club	06	00	1	4.57*
Honorary society	03	03	1	0.00
Dormitory committee	04 (3)	06 (2)	1	0.12
Social Fraternity	24 (10)	09 (5)	1	11.54**
Discussion and "bull session" groups	27	23	1	0.68
Date more than twice a week	22	12	1	4.76*
"Riverbanking"	23	10	1	8.48**
Other	07 (2)	11	1	0.68

*Significant at P = .05 level.
**Significant at P = .01 level.
[a]By "active" is meant that they are participating or have participated regularly during college years. If any were officers of an organization, the number holding such a position appears in parentheses.

TABLE 4

OTHER MISDEMEANOR AND CONTROL GROUP COMPARISONS USING CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS

Variable Studied and Frequency Counts			d.f.	x^2
(1) Residence during 1966-67 school year:	Misdemeanor Group	Control Group		
Off campus	19	18		
Fraternity	12	06	2	3.99
Dormitory	09	16		
(2) Part-time job during the school year:	Misd. Grp.	Cont. Grp.		
No part-time job	20	16		
1-10 hours per week	05	06	2	0.96
More than 10 hours per week	09	12		
(3) Father's occupational level[a]:	Misd. Grp.	Cont. Grp.		
Professional and Managerial (1&2)	10	08		
Semi-professional, small business and skilled (3&4)	16	20	2	0.50
Semiskilled and unskilled (5&6)	03	01		
(4) Hobbies and recreational activities[b]:	Misd. Grp.	Cont. Grp.		
Strictly spectator	01	09		
Athletics and physical activity	49	48		
Cultural and intellectual	14	27	4	19.28**
Social	28	10		
Other	10	08		
(5) Most important reason for attending college[c]:	Misd. Grp.	Cont. Grp.		
Develop mind and intellect	08	10		
Secure vocational or professional training	15	12	3	1.66
Earn a higher income	05	03		
Other reasons	06	09		

**Significant at P = .01 level.

[a]Roe's (1956, pp. 169-248) classification system was used. The numbers in parentheses indicate which of her levels are included in each category. There were only 29 completed pairs for this category because both groups had fathers deceased, retired, or occupations were not given.

[b]Each student listed his three favorite hobbies or recreational activities.

[c]Students were to choose from ten goals (Baird, 1967, pp. 1-2) that were listed.